NOV 1 5 2005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

The information in this transmission is confidential and may be privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Dissemination, reproduction or any other use of this information by any person or entity other than the named recipient is strictly prohibited and is a violation of law. If the information in this transmission is erroneously transmitted to or received by any person or entity other than the named recipient, please contact the undersigned immediately by collect telephone call to arrange for return of the information at no cost to you.

Certificate of Facsimile Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby	certify	that	this	correspor	idence	is	being	transm	itted	via	facsimile	to	571-27	73-8300	on	15
NOVEMBI	ER 2005	addr	esseg	dro: ASSI	STANT	CC	MMIS	SIONER	FOR F	PATE	ENTS, ALI	EXAI	NDERI	A. VA 2	231	3.
				Y	`) \{		^					·		

Roland K. Bowler II

Applicant:	WALCZAK ET AL.)	
Appl. No.	09/769,122	Examiner S. Bhattacharya
F F)	Art Unit 2685
Confirm. No.	5562)	•
Filed:) 24 January 2001)	Atty. Docket No. CS10560

Title:

"Method And System For Validating A Mobile Station

Location Fix"

TRANSMITTAL UNDER 37 CFR 41.31

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Alexandria, Virginia 22313

Sir:

WALCZAK ET AL.
"Method And System for Validating A
Mobile Station Location Fix"
Atty. Docket No. CS10560

NOV 1 5 2005

Appl. No. 09/769,122 Confirm. No. 5562 Examiner S. Bhattacharya Art Unit 2685

The following is enclosed in response to the non-final Office Action of 12 August 2005:

- [X] Notice of Appeal Under 37 CFR 41.31 (1 page);
- [X] Pre-Appeal Brief Review Request (5 pages);
- [X] Petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a); and
- [X] Fee Calculation Sheet (DUPLICATE).

Respectfully submitted,

ROLAND K. BOWLER II

15 Nov. 2005

REG. No. 33,477

MOTOROLA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (RKB)
600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, AN475
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

TELEPHONE No. (847) 523-3978 FACSIMILE No. (847) 523-2350

NOV 1 5 2005

							,		Com	plete if i	Cnown					
FEE									Appli	Application Number 09/796,122						
TRANSMITTAL										Date			24 January 2004			
Patent fees are subject to annual revision										Named I	nventor		WALCZAK			
Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27										iner Nar	ne		S. Bhattacharya			
									Grou	o Art Uni	t		2687			
			TOTAL	AMOUNT OF PA	YMENT (\$) 620	.00		Atton	Attorney Docket No. CS10560						
		M	THOD O	F PAYMENT	(check a	ll that ap	ply)		Ī	FEE CALCULATION (continued)						
Check	T	Credit ca	<u></u>	Money Order	Т Т,	Vhor.	None		4. AD	DITIONA	L FEES	_				
	ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ			MORELY CAGE		TerlK	None		 	Large Small						
X Dep	ooşit Aç								į.	<u>Ently</u>	!	ntity				
1	D	Conselt Accor		_		2117			Fee	Fee	Fee	Feo				
		Doposit Acc			мото	ROLA I	<u>ic.</u>		Code	(\$)	Godo	(\$)	Fee Description			
X The C		r is authoriz e fee(s) indic		k all that apply)	X	Credite	uny overpaymer	ns	1051 1052	130 50	2051 2052	65 25	Surcharge - late filing tee or oath Surcharge - late Provisional filing	├ ─┤ ;		
	OL								1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification			
	Charge	o any accomo	nai ice(s) or	underpayments	of focts) un	00f 37 C/F	R 1.16 and 1.17	,	1812	2520	1812	2520	For filing a request for ex parts Reexamination	 		
			ndicated belo deposit accou	w, except for the	ne filling fee	to the			1804	920*	1804	920	Requesting publication of SIR pater to Examiner action			
		• •••••		- 11.					1805	1840"	1805	1840*	Requesting publication of SITI after			
		• •	F	EE CALCU	LATIO	N			1251	120	2251	60	Examiner action Extension for reply within first month	120		
				•					1252	450	2252	225	Extension for reply within eccond month			
1 BACICE	31 IMC	CEADOU	ANDEVAN	INATION FEE	_				1253 1254	1020	2253 2254	510	Extension for raply within third month	$\perp \perp \mid$		
I. DASIC F			NG FEES	INATION FEE	CHFEES	EYAMI	NATION FEES	1		1590		795	Extension for raply within fourth month	\vdash		
Analestes To			Small Entry					ĺ	1256	2160	2255	1080	Extension for reply within fifth month			
Application Tyl		Large Foo (\$)	Fee (\$)	targe For (\$)	Small tentity Foc(\$)	Large Foe(\$)	Small Entir, Fee(\$)		1401	500	2401	250	Notice of Appeal	500		
Uulity		300	150	500	250	200	100	Fee Pald	1402	500 1000	2402 2403	250 500	Filing a bdel in support of an appeal Request for oral bearing	\vdash		
Design		200	100	100	50	130	65		⊣				•	├ ──┤ │		
Plant		200	100	300	150	150	80		1451	1510 500	1451 2452	1510 250	Petition to institute a public use proceeding Petition to revive — unavoidable	\vdash		
Reissuo		300	150	500	250	600	300		1453	1500	2453	750	Petition to revive - unintentional			
Provisional	I	200	100	0	0	0	0		1501	1400	2501	700	Utility (saue tee (or reissue)			
	Ł			1		<u> </u>		1	1502	800	2502	400	Design Issue fee			
									1503 1460	1100 130	2503 1460	550 130	Plant issue fee Petitions to the Commissioner			
									1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 97 OFR 1 17(g)			
2. EXTRA							Foes (\$)	Email Easty Fee (\$)	1806	180	1800	180	Submission of IDS			
				20 and more than dependent claim mo			50 1 200	25 100	8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per properly (times number of prepartes)			
Multiple Depend	fort Chin	RS					360	180	1809	790	2809	395	Filing a submission after final			
Your Claims	.	EstaC	Sepietra	Pros (\$)	I so Paxi (\$)	ם כ		andani Claires	╡				rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))			
HP = highest nu	20 or HF imber of t		for, il greater th	50 *			(N)	Fee Paid (\$	1810	790	2810	395	For each additional invention to be executed (37 CFR § 1 129(b))			
Indop. Claims		Γ	Extra China	·	Fee (\$)	7	Feo Paid (S)		1801	790	2501	395	Request for Continued Examination			
	-3 or F	dP ∎ _		x	200				1802	900	1602	900	Request for expedited paramination of a design application			
3. APPLICA	3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE												- 4,			
If the specification and drawings exceed 100 shoots of paper, the application size (se is \$250 (\$125 for small entity)													Pee Paid (\$)	620		
For each additional 50 sheets or traction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(a). Total Sheets She									-							
Total Sheets Extra Sheet; 50 or fraction Served Pec (5) Fee Paid (5)									Ⅎℴℼ	5. OTHER FEE(S) (specify)						
	•									Non-English Specification, \$130 lee (no small entity discount)						
		/)					Fee Pati (\$)							
SUBMITTE	nev		BO!	AND K DOW	60 f											
SUBMITTED BY ROLAND K. BOWLER II Name (Print/Type)								Projet	Designation 81							
Agning (Light)	· IPO		 	$\overline{}$	\leftarrow				- registi	Registration No. 33,477 Telephone 847-523-397						
Signature						<u>~</u>			Date	Date 15 November 2005						

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER NOV 1 5 2005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

18475232350

Applicant:	WALCZAK ET AL.)	
Appl. No.	09/769,122)	Examiner S. Bhattacharya
••	. ,	į	Art Unit 2685
Confirm. No.	5562)	Atty. Docket No. CS10560
Filed:	24 January 2001)	,
Title:	"Method And Syste Location Fix"	m For	Validating A Mobile Station

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REVIEW REQUEST

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Alexandria, Virginia 22313

Sir:

Request for Reconsideration & Claims Pending

The instant Request has been filed contemporaneously with a Notice of Appeal filed under 37 CFR 41.31 in response to the final Office Action mailed on 12 August 2005. No amendments have been filed under 37 CFR 1.116. Reconsideration of the claimed invention in view of the discussion below is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 14, 16, 20, 24, 28-30, 32 and 33 were indicated as being allowable.

Claims 1-33 are pending.

11/17/2005 EAREGAY1 00000063 502117 09796122

01 FC:1401

500.00 DA

NOV 1 5 2005

WALCZAK ET AL.

"Method And System for Validating A
Mobile Station Location Fix"

Atty. Docket No. CS10560

Appl. No. 09/769,122 Confirm, No. 5562 Examiner S. Bhattacharya Art Unit 2685

TO:USPTO

Patentability of Claims Over Kingdon

Rejection Summary

Claims 1-3, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,411,811 (Kingdon).

Allowability of Claim 1

Regarding Claim 1, Kingdon fails to disclose or suggest a

...method for validating a non-network based location fix of a mobile station in a communications network, comprising:

generating a non-network based location fix of the mobile station; evaluating the validity of the non-network based location fix of the mobile station by comparing the non-network based location fix with a prior network based location fix.

The Examiner's reliance on Kingdon is misplaced. At col. 3, lines 1-19 (referenced by the Examiner), Kingdon discloses a cellular communication network have multiple GPS receiver stations that provide GPS assistance data (visible satellites, ephemeris and clock correction information) to mobile terminals in the network. In Kingdon, the GPS assistance information is provided by GPS receiver station nearest the mobile terminal's local position estimate that is determined based on the base transceiver station serving the mobile terminal. King uses the assistance information to determine what satellite to use for computing location. There is no discussion in Kingdon of evaluating the validity of the non-network based location fix by comparing the non-network based location fix with a prior network based location fix of the mobile terminal. Claim 1 is thus patentably distinguished over Kingdon.

WALCZAK ET AL.

"Method And System for Validating A
Mobile Station Location Fix"

Atty. Docket No. CS10560

Appl. No. 09/769,122 Confirm. No. 5562 Examiner S. Bhattacharya Art Unit 2685

Allowability of Claim 12

Regarding Claim 12, Kingdon fails to disclose or suggest a

... method for validating a satellite positioning system based location fix of a satellite positioning system enabled cellular mobile station in a cellular communications network, comprising:

generating a satellite positioning system based location fix of the mobile station;

evaluating the validity of the satellite positioning system based location fix by comparing the satellite positioning system based location fix to a prior network based location fix.

Kingdon discloses a cellular communication network have multiple GPS receiver stations that provide GPS assistance data (visible satellites, ephemeris and clock correction information) to mobile terminals in the network. In Kingdon, the GPS assistance information is provided by GPS receiver station nearest the mobile terminal's local position estimate, which is determined based on the base transceiver station serving the mobile terminal. King uses the assistance information to determine what satellite to use for computing location. Kingdon does not disclose or suggest evaluating the validity of the satellite positioning system based location fix by comparing the satellite positioning system based location fix to a prior network based location fix. Claim 12 is thus patentably distinguished over Kingdon.

Patentability of Claims Over Fan

Rejection Summary

Claims 21-23, 25-27 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,906,655 (Fan).

WALCZAK ET AL.

"Method And System for Validating A
Mobile Station Location Fix"

Atty. Docket No. CS10560

Appl. No. 09/769,122 Confirm. No. 5562 Examiner S. Bhattacharya Art Unit 2685

Allowability of Claim 21

Regarding Claim 21, Fan fails to disclose or suggest a

... method for validating a location fix of a mobile station, comprising: generating a plurality of location fixes of the mobile station; evaluating the validity of a recently generated location fix of the mobile station by comparing the location fix for which the validity determination is required to a previously generated mobile station location fix.

At col. 3, lines 2-19, when GPS and inertial navigation unit (INU) position determinations in a mobile machine are mismatched, Fan compares a gyroscope heading rate with a calculated heading rate to determine whether the INU or GPS positions are invalid. Fan does not evaluate the validity of a recently generated location fix of the mobile station by comparing the location fix for which the validity determination is required to a previously generated mobile station location fix. Claim 21 is thus patentably distinguished over Fan.

Allowability of Claim 27

Regarding Claim 27, Fan fails to disclose or suggest a

- ... cellular mobile station, comprising:
- a satellite positioning system signal reception interface in the mobile station for receiving satellite positioning system signals;
- a cellular communications network interface in the mobile station for communicating with a cellular communications network;
- an information processor coupled to the satellite positioning system signal reception interface and the cellular communications network interface,
- the information processor for evaluating the validity of a satellite positioning system based location fix by comparing it to at least one prior mobile station location fix.

WALCZAK ET AL,
"Method And System for Validating A
Mobile Station Location Fix"
Atty. Docket No. CS10560

Appl. No. 09/769,122 Confirm. No. 5562 Examiner S. Bhattacharya Art Unit 2685

At col. 3, lines 2-19, when GPS and inertial navigation unit (INU) position determinations in a mobile machine are mismatched, Fan compares a gyroscope heading rate with a calculated heading rate to determine whether the INU or GPS positions are invalid. Fan does not discloses an information processor for evaluating the validity of a satellite positioning system based location fix by comparing it to at least one prior mobile station location fix. Claim 27 is thus patentably distinguished over Fan.

Prayer For Relief

In view of the discussion above, the Claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly withdraw any rejections and objections and allow this application to issue as a United States Patent without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

ROLAND K. BOWLER II

15 Nov. 2005

REG. No. 33,477

MOTOROLA, INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (RKB) 600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, AN475 LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

TELEPHONE No. (847) 523-3978 FACSIMILE No. (847) 523-2350